

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,106	02/02/2001	Dearg S Brown	PM-276502/Z- 8384	
9629	7590 06/17/2003			
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			EXAMINER	
	YLVANIA AVENUE NW DN, DC 20004		MCKENZIE, THOMAS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/762,106	BROWN ET AL.				
Auvisory Aution	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas McKenzie Ph.D.	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIST Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a				
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire leading ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of the co	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting requesting the application in condition for allowance becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 8.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5,6,9,10 and 12</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer						
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-				
-						

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Determining if the term diseases mediated by TNF is definite and if Applicants are enabled for this use will require additional search and consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While lines 4-13, page 23 provide some guidance as to the structures of the claimed in-vivo hydrolysable esters, Applicants indicate that they intend this limitation to cover esters in addition to those specified in the cited passage. We still do not know the structures of these additional esters. Directions to the pharmacologist fo how to search for Applicants' claimed esters do not substitute for the structures required to the average organic chemist to understand the metes and bounds of Applicants claims.

SUPER LINE

MUKUND J. SHAH
MUKUND J. SHAH
MUKUND J. SHAH
SORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP BOOK